

~~SECRET~~

SUMMARY OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR (SUPPORT) OFFICE HEADS' VIEWS

A large majority of the DD/S reports on the Inspector General's Survey expressed strongly the opinion that generalized statements had been made in the Survey and conclusions reached without adequate information or facts submitted to back up the arguments. There was general agreement that the Survey condemned too strongly the present system and its shortcomings and failed to recognize some accomplishments it had achieved. In several chapters of the Survey, the reports pointed out, there are either statements or implications that the present career system has failed, and most commenters were unwilling to accept this statement as a valid premise for further action. There was objection to the idea that "throughout the Agency career planning is viewed as a burdensome exercise", that "the Agency has little to offer young people that will make a career in intelligence work attractive", and that under our present system there is little chance for advancement. These and other assumptions left individuals uncertain as to what was intended, confused about some conflicts, and strongly opposed to taking some of the statements on faith.

One of the most-nearly unanimous views of the Support Office Heads was the rejection of the recommendation that career services be set up along occupational lines. Aside from posing difficulties of definitions in many instances, this system would also entail management problems cutting laterally through all organizational units, problems which would almost inevitably be greater than vertical problems in an organization like CIA. Furthermore, it was felt that an individual's allegiance and enthusiasm are contributed better in a vertical chain of command than in one running horizontally throughout the organization.

Closely tied to this view was the reaction to the Inspector General's recommendation that only one of the suggested five career services be designated a service of intelligence officers. Whether intended or not, the Survey gave the impression that those in Support Offices would be ineligible for the Intelligence Officer Career Service, and in practically all responses there was strong opposition to this exclusion. Many expressed satisfaction with the growth of effectiveness of Support groups within the last years and the consequent increase of respect and requests on the part of those areas benefitting from this support. (There were six Office Heads who agreed that some restriction of membership might prove beneficial, but even these agreed that further study would be needed to determine how

~~SECRET~~

it might be done fairly and effectively, and in all six instances the assumption was that Support would not be excluded.) In fact, the position was very strongly taken by practically every respondent that automatic exclusion of Support employees would be an unfortunate if not critically divisive action in the Agency.

A fourth common theme running through the DD/S responses involved reaction to the establishment of the recommended Career Development Board. There was a fairly wide variety of modifications suggested in the reports and there were descriptions of ways in which the plan might be made to work. The consensus was, however, that although some central body was needed to be responsible for career service matters in the Agency and although some mechanism was required for facilitating lateral rotations and appointments between individual services, this entire problem needed further study. Above all, it was felt, a clarification was needed to be responsible for career service matters in the Agency and although some mechanism was required for facilitating lateral rotations and appointments between individual services, this entire problem needed further study. Above all, it was felt a clarification was needed of the advisory vs. command role such a body would have. *Deleted per D/S 4/29/68*

Paramount among the objections to the Career Development Board as described in the Survey was the strong objection to the encroachment of such a Board on the rightful authority of the Director of Personnel. As a result, many suggested that any such board established should report to the Director of Personnel, either to study the problems raised by the Survey and to make recommendations or to support him in implementing policy decisions to do with career service. There was no doubt as to the vigor of the reactions in favor of clarifying and reaffirming the authority of the Director of Personnel in these matters.

Finally, and implicit if not stated in every report submitted, there was the idea that it would be better to use and modify existing mechanisms and procedures rather than scrap what had been achieved and attempt to establish a completely new system. The inevitable upset such a drastic change would cause and the worth of some of the attainments of the present system were given as the main reasons for this view. Though several stated that the Inspector General had correctly described some of the failures and disadvantages of the Career Service now in existence, there was unanimity on the idea that much of the system was working, much could be corrected and modified, and that a major upheaval at this time might lose for the Agency a great deal more ground than it would gain - might, indeed, even be disastrous.

~~SECRET~~